

REMARKS

In the present Amendment, the title has been amended.

Claim 1 has been amended to replace “or” at line 6 with --and--.

Claim 3 has been amended to delete “or Ozatek PL 14 (from Hoechst).”

Claim 15 has been amended to delete “)” at the end of the claim.

Claim 20 has been amended at lines 3 to 4 to replace “said mold” with --said mold surface--.

Claims 9, 11, 24, 25, 29 and 38 have been amended to use appropriate Markush format.

Claims 9, 31 and 35 have been amended to correct a typographical or grammatical error.

Claims 41 to 43 have been canceled.

No new matter has been added and entry of the Amendment is respectfully requested.

Upon entry of the Amendment, claims 1-40 will be all the claims pending in the application.

I. Information Disclosure Statement

In Paragraph No. 3 of the Office Action, the Examiner requested a copy of the Australian reference cited in the Form PTO/SB/08 A&B filed with Applicants’ Information Disclosure Statement of June 19, 2002.

Applicants wish to point out that Australian Application No. 61484/99 represents the Australian designation of WO00/17102 which is also cited in the Form PTO/SB/08 A&B of June 19, 2002. Since this international application did not enter the national phase in Australia, the specification on record at the Australian Patent Office for Australian Application No. 61484/99 is the same as the specification of WO00/17102.

II. Response to Objection to Specification

In Paragraph No. 4 of the Office Action, the Examiner asserts that the title is not descriptive.

In response, Applicants have in the present Amendment, amended the title to recite --PROCESS OF MAKING ALIGNED CARBON NANOTUBES--, as suggested by the Examiner. Accordingly, the Examiner is respectfully requested to reconsider and withdraw the objection.

III. Response to Rejection Under 35 U.S.C. § 112, Second Paragraph

In Paragraph No. 6 of the Office Action, claims 1-43 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph, as allegedly being indefinite.

Applicants respectfully submit that the amended claims are not indefinite. As noted above, Applicants have in the present Amendment amended the claims as suggested by the Examiner. Accordingly, the Examiner is respectfully requested to reconsider and withdraw the rejection.

IV. Response to Rejection Under 35 U.S.C. § 102

In Paragraph No. 8 of the Office Action, claims 41-43 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) as allegedly being anticipated by either Chuang et al (U.S. Pat. No. 6,062,931), Nakamoto (U.S. Pat. No. 6,097,138) or Den et al (U.S. Pat. No. 6,628,053).

Applicants respectfully submit that the rejection is moot because claims 41-43 have been canceled.

In view of the above, reconsideration and allowance of this application are now believed to be in order, and such actions are hereby solicited. If any points remain in issue which the

AMENDMENT UNDER 37 C.F.R. § 1.111
U.S. Application No.: 10/088,737

Attorney Docket Q69176

Examiner feels may be best resolved through a personal or telephone interview, the Examiner is kindly requested to contact the undersigned at the telephone number listed below.

The USPTO is directed and authorized to charge all required fees, except for the Issue Fee and the Publication Fee, to Deposit Account No. 19-4880. Please also credit any overpayments to said Deposit Account.

Respectfully submitted,



Fang Liu
Registration No. 51,283

SUGHRUE MION, PLLC
Telephone: (202) 293-7060
Facsimile: (202) 293-7860

WASHINGTON OFFICE

23373

CUSTOMER NUMBER

Date: September 27, 2004